

BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT DATA**FCC: 2018 Broadband Deployment Report***Table 1 – Deployment (millions) of Fixed Terrestrial 25 Mbps/ 3 Mbps Services*

	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016	
	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%
United States	254.395	81.2%	263.971	83.6%	284.277	89.4%	286.911	89.6%	297.766	92.3%
Rural Areas	27.694	45.7	29.077	47.6	37.202	60.4	37.795	60.7	43.604	69.3
Urban Areas	226.701	89.7	234.893	92.3	247.075	96.4	249.116	96.5	254.162	97.9
Tribal Lands	1.247	32.2	1.449	37.1	2.250	57.2	2.289	57.8	2.578	64.6
Pop. Evaluated	313.389	100.0%	315.596	100.0%	317.954	100.0%	320.289	100.0%	322.518	100.0%

Table 3a - Deployment (Millions) of Fixed Terrestrial 25 Mbps/3 Mbps Services and Mobile LTE with a Speed of 5 Mbps/1 Mbps

	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016	
	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%
United States	241.292	77.0%	261.977	83.0%	283.417	89.1%	286.447	89.4%	297.304	92.2%
Rural Areas	20.266	33.5	27.776	45.5	36.517	59.2	37.366	60.0	43.164	68.6
Urban Areas	221.025	87.4	234.200	92.0	246.900	96.3	249.081	96.5	254.141	97.9
Tribal Lands	1.117	28.8	1.385	35.5	2.212	56.2	2.258	57.0	2.550	63.9
Pop. Evaluated	313.389	100.0%	315.596	100.0%	317.954	100.0%	320.289	100.0%	322.518	100.0%

FCC: 2018 Broadband Progress Report*Table 5 -Deployment (Ten Thousands) on Tribal Lands with Access to Fixed Terrestrial 25 Mbps/3 Mbps Services and Mobile LTE with a Speed of 5 Mbps/1 Mbps*

	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016	
	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%
All Tribal Lands	111.653	28.8%	138.505	35.5%	221.177	56.2%	225.788	57.0%	254.954	63.9%
Rural Areas	14.228	7.2	28.306	14.1	59.658	29.5	61.377	30.1	84.452	40.9
Urban Areas	97.425	51.5	110.198	57.9	161.519	84.5	164.412	85.6	170.502	88.5
Alaskan Villages	0.022	0.1%	7.126	28.2%	11.329	44.4%	11.027	42.7%	13.483	51.5%
Rural Areas	0.013	0.1	2.113	13.1	4.214	25.8	3.920	23.7	6.096	36.2
Urban Areas	0.010	0.1	5.013	54.9	7.115	77.4	7.107	76.7	7.387	79.0
Hawaiian Homelands	2.850	89.8%	2.924	90.6%	3.169	96.9%	2.955	88.9%	2.961	88.6%
Rural Areas	0.250	50.9	0.235	45.0	0.455	83.0	0.246	43.9	0.250	43.5
Urban Areas	2.600	96.9	2.688	99.4	2.715	99.8	2.709	98.0	2.711	98.0
Lower 48 States	21.111	19.9%	32.069	30.0%	41.861	38.8%	45.187	41.5%	49.278	44.6%
Rural Areas	5.680	8.1	13.364	18.9	18.512	25.8	20.668	28.4	23.360	31.6
Urban Areas	15.432	43.0	18.705	51.9	23.349	64.8	24.519	67.8	25.918	71.2
Tribal Statistical Areas	87.669	34.6%	96.386	37.8%	164.818	64.2%	166.619	64.5%	189.232	73.0%
Rural Areas	8.285	7.4	12.594	11.2	36.477	32.1	36.542	32.0	54.746	47.6
Urban Areas	79.384	56.1	83.793	58.8	128.341	89.7	130.077	90.3	134.486	93.3
Pop. Evaluated	387.603	100%	390.508	100%	393.310	100%	396.401	100%	399.114	100%

NTTA MEMBERS – FEDERAL USE COST PER LOOP

Company	2016 CPL
CRST	\$ 2,364.69
FMTI	\$ 2,916.50
SADDLEBACK	\$ 1,940.07
TOUA	\$ 1,498.09
MATI	\$ 1,668.55
GRTI	\$ 2,657.28
SCATUI	\$ 1,935.10
SWC	\$ 3,141.98
NTTA Average	\$ 2,265.28
<i>National Average</i>	<i>\$ 1,129.97</i>

NTTA Members – Budget Control Mechanism, 2018-2019

Company	Forecast Total	Adjusted Total	Change
CRST	\$ 4,292,761	\$ 3,754,127	\$ (538,634)
FMTI	\$ 2,041,868	\$ 1,807,733	\$ (234,135)
HOPI	\$ 7,242	\$ 6,638	\$ (604)
SADDLEBACK	\$ 1,571,232	\$ 1,318,152	\$ (253,080)
TOUA	\$ 2,971,145	\$ 2,532,146	\$ (438,999)
MATI	\$ 2,153,116	\$ 1,898,762	\$ (254,354)
GRTI	\$ 7,185,415	\$ 6,316,218	\$ (869,197)
SCATUI	\$ 3,618,437	\$ 3,168,212	\$ (450,225)
Sacred Wind	\$ 9,348,736	\$ 8,280,488	\$ (1,068,248)
Totals	\$ 33,189,952	\$ 29,082,476	\$ (4,107,476)
			-12.38%

NTTA Members – Offer of Support from March 23, 2018 “TBF” Proposal

Holding Company	Total Non-Tribal and Tribal Annual Model-Based Support Offer (\$146.10 Funding CAP) From Report 12.1	Total Non-Tribal and Tribal Annual Model-Based Support Offer (\$200 Funding CAP) From Report 13.1	2017 HCLS and CAF BLS	Difference 12.1	Difference 13.1
Fort Mojave Telecommunications, Inc.	\$ 112,425	\$ 120,833	\$ 2,085,861	\$ (1,973,436)	\$ (1,965,028)
Gila River Telecommunications, Inc.	\$ 469,841	\$ 513,688	\$ 7,865,586	\$ (7,395,745)	\$ (7,351,898)
Saddleback Communications Inc.	\$ 169,290	\$ 178,573	\$ 1,987,683	\$ (1,818,393)	\$ (1,809,110)
San Carlos Apache Telecommunications Utility, Inc.	\$ 1,020,765	\$ 1,128,025	\$ 3,354,969	\$ (2,334,204)	\$ (2,226,944)
Mescalero Apache Telecom, Inc.	\$ 965,001	\$ 1,094,764	\$ 2,105,610	\$ (1,140,609)	\$ (1,010,846)
Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Telephone Authority	\$ 2,286,135	\$ 2,767,161	\$ 4,626,726	\$ (2,340,591)	\$ (1,859,565)
Totals	\$ 5,023,456	\$ 5,803,044	\$ 22,026,435	\$ (17,002,979)	\$ (16,223,391)

ONAP TRIBAL ENGAGEMENT FURTHER GUIDANCE

- FCC adopted Tribal Engagement Rules in the 2011 USF/ICC Transformation Order:

47 CFR § 54.313(a)

- 9) *Beginning July 1, 2013.* To the extent the recipient serves Tribal lands, documents or information demonstrating that the ETC had discussions with Tribal governments that, at a minimum, included:
- (i) A needs assessment and deployment planning with a focus on Tribal community anchor institutions;
 - (ii) Feasibility and sustainability planning;
 - (iii) Marketing services in a culturally sensitive manner;
 - (iv) Rights of way processes, land use permitting, facilities siting, environmental and cultural preservation review processes; and
 - (v) Compliance with Tribal business and licensing requirements. Tribal business and licensing requirements include business practice licenses that Tribal and non-Tribal business entities, whether located on or off Tribal lands, must obtain upon application to the relevant Tribal government office or division to conduct any business or trade, or deliver any goods or services to the Tribes, Tribal members, or Tribal lands. These include certificates of public convenience and necessity, Tribal business licenses, master licenses, and other related forms of Tribal government licensure.

- ONAP, WCB, WTB Adopted Further Guidance for the Tribal Engagement Rules
- DA 12-1165, released July 29, 2012
 - Offers guidance on all aspects of the Tribal Engagement Rules
- USTelecom filed at least 3 petitions for reconsideration of the Tribal Engagement rules and/or the Further Guidance.
- Claimed, among other things, that the rules were adopted without a cost/benefit analysis
 - Stated the Further Guidance was adopted outside of the Administrative Procedures Act, and should only apply, if at all, to a limited set of ETCs (Tribal CAF and Mobility Phase II recipients).
 - Comment cycle on the latest PFR was complete in early 2013